on the needs of under-developed countries. Here is a serious warning to democracies not to kill democratic freedoms in the fear that they may be killed by the enemies of democracies. One regrets that the problems of the industrial laborer in under-developed countries did not receive serious attention in the report. While the revolution in the East is certainly dominantly agrarian and the Communist successes are to be attributed partly to their having captured the impulses working beneath this agrarian revolution for their own ends, some countries of the East are passing through the agonies attendant on an industrial revolution too. Plantation labor is another of the big problems in the East and one gathers in Latin America too. These subjects need to be studied more thoroughly by those interested in the Responsible Society.

In regard to Church unity, the Assembly went somewhat further than at Amsterdam. In 1948, though the question of Church unity was in the background of discussion it never seriously came to the surface. At Evanston, throughout all the discussions in Section I, the imperative need for unity was uppermost in the minds of many. Nevertheless the impression one is compelled to form is that it will still be a long time before the Churches in the West will take serious and concrete steps toward real Christian unity. The Faith and Order Commission has done important work for over a quarter of a century on the problem of Christian unity and it will go on discussing various issues that are involved in the movement for Christian unity. Nothing, however, will be achieved by the Faith and Order Commission or by the General Assemblies of the World Council of Churches unless Churches in their own regions cease to be self-centered and start looking at their neighboring Churches to see if they could not start conversations for unity. Unity cannot come from the top, from a world organization; it must grow from the bottom. The World Council of Churches, or the Faith and Order Commission, cannot be expected to achieve anything that the Churches themselves do not care to achieve. Recommendations for unity from without carry little weight. Unity is achieved when there is a real conviction growing from within. There was little evidence of this at Evanston. Cultural factors and the weight of history are obviously still too strong for any real stirrings of conviction from within. Protestant Christendom will have to answer before the Lord for this complacency. It is not a failing of the World

Council of Churches that there is this complacency—it belongs to the member Churches.

IV

But if we have seen the weakness of Churches in this respect, we have also seen at Evanston that despite their many failings, shortcomings, their insularity, these Churches *consciously* belong to a world-wide movement, a world-wide fellowship. It was impressive, moving, and inspiring to see in miniature a picture of world-Christianity. There were delegates, consultants, and visitors from every continent, from such far off places as the Fiji Islands. They were all there because they all call on the same Lord. Christianity has changed history. The revolution in the East which we are witnessing today and before which many people stand baffled owes its origin and impulses in no mean measure to forces released by the Christian missionary movement in the East. World Christianity will continue to change history till the Lord of History brings in his own time the final consummation of his purposes. Until then the following words of the report of Section I of the Assembly may be taken to express the real hope and prayer of all those united in the World Council of Churches: "At Amsterdam we said we intend to stay together. He has kept us together. He has shown himself again as our hope. Emboldened by this hope, we dedicate ourselves to God anew, that he may enable us to grow together."

V. E. Devadutt

The Human Spirit and the Holy Spirit

THE theme of this issue of Theology Today is "The Human Spirit and the Holy Spirit." Both phrases of the title are important. Sensitive theologians might ask to reverse the order to make it read, "The Holy Spirit and the Human Spirit," but the order as given can be defended as climactic, thus satisfying both literary taste and theological truth. There is no quarrel with the acknowledged fact that, in any coupling of the Holy Spirit and the human spirit, the kingdom and the power and the glory are the Holy Spirit's and not man's.

Humanists chafe at this. They call it the theological humiliation of Man, and quote rebelliously the great sentence from William Faulkner's Stockholm speech at the Nobel Prize awards, "I decline to accept the end of man." But the Christian faith is not against man. Recognition of God does not destroy man; it saves him. It is precisely because the Kingdom is God's that man takes on both stature and hope. By the power of the Spirit, he is brought into the Kingdom, and the Kingdom is eternal. The Spirit, too, declines to accept the end of man.

The Evanston meeting of the World Council of Churches has been criticized by some for being too other-worldly, putting too much emphasis on eschatology and the Second Coming and the Holy Spirit. By others it has been accused of being too this-worldly, relying too much on the human spirit. Professor V. E. Devadutt's guest-editorial, "After Evanston—What?", does neither. It is a friendly, well-considered appraisal of the great Assembly, and a look to the future of the ecumenical movement by one of the foremost spokesmen of the younger Churches which are playing an increasingly significant role in the World Council of Churches.

Professor V. E. Devadutt, Dean of Theology of Serampore College, India, and Editor of *The Indian Journal of Theology,* holds the doctorate of theology from the University of Toronto. He is a Baptist, but last year he was Visiting Professor at a Presbyterian stronghold, Princeton Theological Seminary, and this year has moved into Methodist circles as Professor of the History of Religions at Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

Dr. Theodore P. Ferris's devotional commentary, "Christians, But Not Quite," is on the side of the theologians, not the humanists. The baptism of man is not enough, he points out; it takes the baptism of the Spirit to make Christians. "The Churches are filled with people who are Christians, but not quite. They know the Gospel. They try to live a good Christian life. . . . But they have missed what the way of God really means. . . . They have never been receivers of God's grace. . . ."

Dr. Ferris's comments are an exposition of Acts 18: 24–28, the story of Apollos in Ephesus, and are reprinted by permission from *The Interpreter's Bible,* Vol. IX. The expositor is rector of Trinity Church, Copley Square, Boston, and is the author of a number of books, including *This Created World* (1944), and *Go Tell the People* (1951), the George Stewart lectures on preaching.

It has proved easier for men to acknowledge the primacy of the divine Spirit than to define it. Professor Hendry's article, "From the Father and the Son: the *Filioque* after 900 Years," deals with the theological base of the schism that split East from West nine hundred years ago over the *filioque* clause in the Nicene Creed's statement of the "procession" of the Holy Spirit. That controversy, as he observes, is often cited "as a signal example of the propensity for hairsplitting which is considered indigenous to the race of theologians," but Dr. Hendry accomplishes the miracle of making the old debate come alive with meaning for the ecumenical movement today. Of particular interest is his critical analysis of Karl Barth's theological defense of the double procession of the Spirit. Dr. Hendry's own conclusion is that the *filioque* is a "false solution to a real problem," and that when that problem (the tension between concern for the unity and for the Trinity of the Godhead) "is defined in terms of the *Filioque* it is inevitably distorted."

George S. Hendry is one of the Scottish theologians who, with others, played an active part in the founding of the *Scottish Journal of Theology*. His Hastie Lectures at the University of Glasgow have been published under the title, *God the Creator* (1937). He is now Charles Hodge Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary. The present article grew out of a series of lectures given at The Seminaries of the American Lutheran Church, Columbus, Ohio, and Dubuque, Iowa.

The next article is a study of psychology and religion which, as might be expected, begins by centering attention on the human spirit. But in "Biblical Faith and Natural Religion," Will Herberg uses John H. Masserman's "sensational reversal of Freud on religion" only as a springboard for a discussion of the shattering difference between the God-centered faith of the Bible, and the man-centered "natural religion" of the psychiatrists. To Freud, religion is an illusion blocking the return to reality. Masserman turns Freud upside down, asserting that there are at least three basic religious "convictions" which are as necessary to man as his skin. With this

comforting vindication of religion, it might be assumed, the article will end. But it is only the beginning for Herberg. He unexpectedly reverses his field until what is finally vindicated is not religion, but Biblical faith.

Will Herberg represents the movement in Reformed Judaism that calls for a revival of theological concern. He has studied at Union Theological Seminary, New York, and is a popular lecturer on religious subjects at colleges and universities, most recently at Dartmouth. He is an author—*Judaism and Modern Man* (1951)—and has served as Educational Director of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union.

Robert G. Middleton, in "The Gospel and the Younger Generation," presents another diagnosis of the ills of the human spirit in our time. The younger generation, he says, "is living in an era of numbing fear and chastened hope." Its mood "borders very closely on despair"; its disease is spiritual emptiness. The prescription he suggests for the beginnings of a cure will gladden the hearts of theologians. Young people want theology, he says flatly. "This means, of course, that we must once again confront the younger generation with the Christian faith as doctrine."

The author is a graduate of Colgate University and Colgate-Rochester Divinity School and is pastor of the First Baptist Church of Haddonfield, N. J., his second pastorate. He has written for the *Christian Century, Religion and Life,* and *Christianity and Crisis.*

"Does Spiritual Faith Insure Physical Benefits?" by Gerald Runkle considers one of the specific problems of the relation between man and the Holy Spirit. It is an examination of the contention of Pascal, William James, and Norman Vincent Peale that since religion confers practical benefits, the wise thing to do is to decide to believe and enjoy the results. Despite its devastating criticism of Peale ("an urbane witch-doctor") and its debatable compression of Pascal's many-sided genius into the narrow mold of his famous wager, the article is nevertheless a refreshing call to a higher approach to God than "trying out beliefs . . . until you find one that will give you happiness (Pascal), cash value (James), or business success (Peale)."

Gerald J. T. Runkle graduated from Oberlin College after three

years in the Army Air Corps during World War II. He holds his Ph.D. from Yale University, and is presently Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Chairman of the department at the Atlanta Division of the University of Georgia.

Professor Piper, too, in "The Power of the Christian Life," lifts the discussion of the work of the Holy Spirit to a higher level, and into broader perspective. The Bible is not adverse to happiness, success, and accomplishment as goals of life, he says, "but it treats them definitely as being of subordinate significance." The goal of God's Spirit is the bringing of the individual "into line with God's saving activity." His practical emphasis on the experience of the gift of the Spirit—how to receive it, and how to have assurance of it—makes the article a welcome contribution to a field of inquiry in which sterile speculation on the one hand and exotic excess on the other have too often withered the real "fruit of the Spirit."

Otto A. Piper, Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis at Princeton Theological Seminary, is President for 1954–55 of the American Theological Society. In addition to numerous publications in German, he is author of *God in History* (1939), *The Christian Interpretation of Sex* (1941), and he has been a frequent contributor to THEOLOGY TODAY.

Dwight L. Moody once remarked, "We read of the wrath of God, of the Lamb. But nowhere do we read of the wrath of the Holy Spirit—gentle, innocent, meek, loving." It is this characteristic of the Spirit which is the underlying emphasis of Norman Snaith's "The Spirit of Righteousness," an exegetical study of the phrase, "such as he is able to get," in Leviticus 14: 22. The importance of the phrase is its disclosure that embedded in the ritual of the Second Temple was a remarkable concern for the poor and the underprivileged—a concern which influenced the Biblical idea of "righteousness." "The Christian approach is not so much to indicate morality by condemning the guilty, but rather to look . . . towards the establishment of right relations and right action. In modern Western thought 'righteousness' belongs to the vocabulary of ethics. In the Bible it belongs rather to the vocabulary of salvation."

Norman H. Snaith, who teaches Old Testament at Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds, England, is the author of a number of im-

portant Old Testament studies, including *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* (1944), *The Jewish New Year Festival, Its Origin and Development* (1947), and *Mercy and Sacrifice, A Study of the Book of Hosea* (1953).

The concluding article in this number, "The Main Issues in Theological Education," is the first report of a special committee appointed by the American Association of Theological Schools to study the whole question of theological education in America at the present time. The general problems surveyed include the nature of the Christian ministry, the tension between vocational and academic demands in ministerial training, and such issues as the relationship of tradition to experience, of the Church to modern society, of denominational loyalties to ecumenicity. The report abounds with quotable insights: about students, "What they fear even more than becoming inept professionals is becoming hypocritical parsons"; about the problem of communication, "There is the danger of being so relevant in communication that the needs of man are defined not in terms of the Gospel but in those of contemporary psychology, sociology, and politics so that the Gospel is not translated but perverted."

Directing the research project is Professor H. Richard Niebuhr of Yale Divinity School, a member of the Editorial Council of THEOLOGY TODAY. He is joined in this preliminary report by Professor Daniel Day Williams of Union Theological Seminary, New York, and James M. Gustafson who has recently been appointed to teach Christian Ethics at Yale Divinity School.

SAMUEL H. MOFFETT

CHRISTIANS, BUT NOT QUITE

BY THEODORE P. FERRIS*

APOLLOS is the kind of man whom we might call a Christian, but not quite. He had a great many of the requirements and many of the electives as well. He had a knowledge of the Scriptures. It is obvious that you cannot be a Christian without that. He had been instructed in the teachings of Jesus. Certainly there is no Christianity without that. Moreover he had the desire to pass on to others what he himself had. He was a missionary. And in addition he had a good background. He had the culture of Alexandria, one of the philosophical centers of the empire. What then did he not have? What was it that Aquila and his wife missed in this fine Christian teacher? The only clue that the Acts gives us is that he did not have the baptism of Jesus; he had only the baptism of John.

If by baptism is meant only a ceremonial or ritual act, then the clue does not lead us far. But the chances are that it means more than that. The baptism of John was a baptism into moral improvement; it initiated men into a great reform movement, and let no one underestimate the importance of it. But it was not the baptism of Jesus, for the baptism of Jesus was a baptism into death and resurrection. It was a dying to self. It was a recognition that of your own self you can do nothing and that you are willing to stand as a sinner in the presence of God, claiming nothing, only counting on his love and forgiveness. It changed the center of things from self-directed effort to God-given grace. It was the difference between a man who tried desperately to be good and a man who admitted that he was a sinner. Once that admission was made, he was raised into a new kind of life in which he had a power over himself that he never had before. Before it, he was like Atlas trying to carry the world on his shoulders; after it, he was like a man carrying the Cross. What a difference! No wonder Aquila and Priscilla took him home and "expounded to him the way of God more accurately," explained

* This is the Exposition of Acts 18: 24–28 in *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 9 (copyright 1954 by Pierce and Washabaugh), pp. 247–250. The passage is reprinted here by the permission of Abingdon Press.

JANUARY, 1955

Theology Today

· THE LIFE OF MAN IN THE LIGHT OF GOD